DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 324 AC 012 179

TITLE	Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	72p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (GPO 65-011-0-71-2)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; *Adult Education; *Annual Reports; Budgeting; *Continuous Learning; Cost Effectiveness; Educational Programs; *Extension Education; *Federal Government; Higher Education; Interagency Coordination; Post Secondary Education; State Federal Aid; State Government

ABSTRACT

This document, under transmittal letter from the President, contains the recommendations and findings of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education with respect to federal involvement in programs for adult education. Recommendations include: (1) The Administration should develop a mechanism at the federal level to coordinate and possibly consolidate all existing programs that have as a major thrust the post-secondary continuing education of adult citizens; (2) The State governments should develop state-wide administrative agreements through the utilization of educational resources to implement effective and efficient programs in continuing education in cooperation with federal agencies; (3) Steps should be taken to expand the federal and state roles in the administration of post-secondary programs for adults under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Appended to this Report is a report to the Council of activities conducted under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It is noted that in the face of severe budget restraints and rigorous re-examination of educational priorities, the Council finds that continuing education and community service needs of the nation have not suffered irreparable damage. (CK)

EDO 57324

1/10/72 AC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

92d Congress, 1st S[illegible] Document No. 92-163 F-Cons

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

MESSAGE

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

THE FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER 15, 1971.—Message and accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
65-011 O WASHINGTON : 1971

AC012179

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

To the Congress of the United States:

The Fifth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education is submitted herewith.

This Council, authorized by Public Law 89–329, has reviewed the administration and effectiveness of the program authorized by title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other federally supported extension and continuing education programs.

Several of the Council's proposals are highly commendable, especially those reflecting a concern for innovation and reform in post-secondary education, including the proposed National Foundation for Higher Education, and its recommendation that programs directed to continuing education for adults be coordinated and consolidated.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1971.*

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON
EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

ROBERT RAY
CHAIRMAN

EDWARD KIELOCH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

1325 G STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

March 31, 1971

The President
The White House
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:

On behalf of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, I am privileged as Chairman to submit to you the Fifth Annual Report of the Council.

The Council was created by Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs and to make annual reports of its findings to you and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This report contains recommendations with respect to the Community Service and Continuing Education Program under Title I, HEA, and other recommendations the Council finds deserving of immediate attention.

Sincerely yours,

Robert F. Ray

Robert F. Ray
Chairman

cc: Secretary of Health, Education,
and Welfare

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Dr. Robert Ray, Dean, Extension & University Services, University of Iowa

Chairman

Public Members

Honorable Joseph Alioto
Mayor of San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Dr. Charles T. Andrews
Associate Dean
College of Business Administration
Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska

Dr. Albert H. Bowker
Chancellor
City University of New York System
New York, New York

Mr. Newton Cattell
Director of Community Relations
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Dr. Cyril O. Houle
Professor of Education
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Jesse C. Kellam
Member Board of Regents
Texas State Senior Colleges
Austin, Texas

Mr. Earl Nunn
Superintendent of Schools
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Mr. Francisco D. Sanchez, Jr.
Coordinator, Office of New Programs
Albuquerque Public Schools
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Mr. Frank J. Van Dyke
Attorney at Law
Van Dyke, Dubay, and Robertson
Medford, Oregon

Dr. Howard Walker
Dean of Continuing Education
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Government Members

One representative each as follows from the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Transportation, as well as of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration:

Mr. Gilbert Anderson
Educational & Cultural Affairs
Department of State

Dr. Roger Prior
Economic Development Administration
Department of Commerce

Mr. Howard Ball
Small Towns Services & Intergovernmental Relations
Department of Housing & Urban Development

Dr. Nathan Brodsky
Education Programs & Management Training
Department of Defense

Mr. Belton O. Bryan
Congressional Relations
Department of Transportation

Mr. Arthur Harvith
Liaison Officer
Small Business Administration

Dr. N. P. Ralston
Office of Science and Education
Department of Agriculture

Miss Mary Robinson
Senior Educational Advisor
Office of Economic Opportunity

Mr. Roland Ross
Manpower Administration
Department of Labor

Dr. Garland S. Wollard
Education Branch, Bureau of Prisons
Department of Justice

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OF THE

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

ON

EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT

SUBMITTED MARCH 31, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COUNCIL

STATUS REPORT ON THE COUNCIL'S REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

REMARKS CONCERNING THE FY 1970 REPORT
ON TITLE I OF THE HIGHER
EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

APPENDIX: Community Service and Continuing Education in 1970, a Report to the Council by the Community Service and Continuing Education Branch, U.S. Office of Education.

65-011 O - 71 - 2

RECOMMENDATIONS

The past year has been a period of substantially increased activity and interest in the field of continuing education and community service. To an existing catalogue of more than 400 Federal programs that involve an expenditure of about $3 billion annually[1] and are addressed partially or wholly to the educational needs of adults, the 91st Congress added ten new programs and extended six others at an authorization level of approximately $2 billion.[2] The Administration has also expressed a lively interest in this area as evidenced by its discussions of the feasibility and desirability of a National Center for Lifelong Learning, its study of the long neglected educational needs of blue collar workers and its expressed interest in special programs for women.

In view of the need for and increasing interest in continuing education for adults, the Council recommends:

1. THAT TO AVOID UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION AND TO ENHANCE EFFICIENCY AND QUALITY OF SERVICE, THE ADMINISTRATION DEVELOP ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISMS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL FOR THE COORDINATION AND POSSIBLE CONSOLIDATION OF THE EXISTING AND GROWING NUMBER OF PROGRAMS THAT HAVE AS A MAJOR THRUST THE POST-SECONDARY CONTINUING EDUCATION OF ADULT CITIZENS.

   Many Federal programs have large "community education" or "adult education" components. The development of Federal administrative and coordinative arrangements should be such as to assure mutual cooperation with and support of the States and their public and private educational institutions in the operation of these programs.

2. THAT STATE GOVERNMENTS DEVELOP STATE-WIDE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS THROUGH THE UTILIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT PROGRAMS OF CONTINUING EDUCATION IN COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL AGENCIES.

   Strengthened administrative capacity will enable the States to develop new and improve existing programs for community service and continuing education and to build additional problem-solving competence in communities. To avoid unnecessary duplication of effort, and to enhance the impact of Federal programs upon local communities, it is desirable to promote the mutually reinforcing processes of improved administration at both State and Federal levels.

3. THAT AS A STEP IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FOREGOING RECOMMENDATIONS, APPROPRIATE ACTIONS BE TAKEN TO EXPAND THE ROLE AND TO STRENGTHEN THE ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF BOTH U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE AGENCIES UNDER TITLE I, OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 IN PROVIDING POST-SECONDARY CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR ADULTS.

Federally supported continuing education programs are being reviewed by this Council in accordance with Section 109 of Title I, and further recommendations will be made about the administration of these programs at Federal and State levels. Currently much can be accomplished through provision of additional staff, in-service training activities and enlarged support at national and State levels for operating expenses--especially the expenses of comprehensive planning and the measurement of program effectiveness. The State Agencies have established statewide liaison with institutions of higher education and other institutions and services whose resources are indispensable to the achievement of purposes contained in many Federal programs. Furthermore, the States pioneered in many instances under Title I, HEA, in bringing early attention to the role that colleges and universities can play in helping communities to alleviate such urgent problems as drug abuse and environmental degradation by providing local and State governments with technical knowledge and programs of continuing education. The cost involved in strengthening State agencies for an enlarged program of service will be far less than that involved in the further proliferation of independent administrative mechanisms.

4. THAT IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF TITLE I, HEA OF 1965, THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION CONTINUE TO WORK DIRECTLY WITH THE STATES.

Both the legislatively mandated formula distribution of funds to States and the present pattern of decentralization involve direct delegation of authority to State Agencies consistent with the spirit of "The New Federalism" which seeks to institutionalize the concept of State determination and administration. Devolution of program responsibilities to ten regional offices is unnecessarily redundant and would not bring decision points closer to the people.

5. THAT THE AUTHORIZED $60 MILLION BE APPROPRIATED FOR TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

The time has come for more substantial support than heretofore available to institutions of higher education and community agencies to combine and focus their resources upon the process of building problem-solving competence in America's cities and towns. Colleges of all types across the country, including rapidly emerging community colleges, are struggling to build and test effective models of community service. Strong support and leadership are required to take advantage of the large opportunities that exist presently for making the teaching and research activities of institutions of higher education instruments of direct service in partnership with the community.

6. THAT THE ACT BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE, WHEN APPROPRIATIONS ARE ABOVE THE 1971 LEVEL, THAT THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SHALL HAVE AVAILABLE TO HIM UP TO TEN PERCENT OF THE SUM APPROPRIATED ANNUALLY FOR GRANTS TO INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS OR CONSORTIA FOR NATIONAL AND REGIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

A limited number of demonstration projects are being conducted to test the viability of the most promising of these patterns. Additional funds are needed to refine them and to replicate successful practices across the country. A modest investment in such an effort now would pay immeasurable dividends for a long time to come, but the potential impact of Title I, HEA in this effort will be lost unless adequate and flexible support is provided.

7. THAT IN FILLING EXISTING AND FUTURE VACANCIES ON THIS COUNCIL, ATTENTION BE GIVEN TO THE SELECTION OF QUALIFIED PERSONS WHO ARE DRAWN FROM A BROAD SPECTRUM OF COMMUNITY BACKGROUNDS.

The needs for continuing education and community service are widely felt in our society, but they are urgent among people whose special requirements have been overlooked or neglected for a long time, including women and ethnic minority groups. Greater representation of such people will enrich the Council's deliberations and enhance its usefulness to the President and the Congress.

8. THAT STATE APPOINTIVE AUTHORITIES UNDER TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT BE ENCOURAGED TO MAKE STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS MORE BROADLY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GROUPS INVOLVED IN AND AFFECTED BY THE PROGRAM.

A recent survey of the States indicates that white male educators predominate in membership on these councils. Women, minorities and community representatives should be adequately represented on advisory bodies. The interest of such persons should be reflected in the determination of program priorities and other decisions that directly affect their welfare.

9. THAT THE ADMINISTRATION CONTINUE ITS EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Council supports the concept of a National Foundation to strengthen the national role in initiating, advocating and supporting new and creative research and demonstration approaches to the learning needs and interests of all Americans.

10. THAT TITLE I OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT BE EXTENDED FOR FIVE ADDITIONAL YEARS.

The Council urges the President and the Congress to continue authority for this successful program.

---

1 2 See Appendix II of the Council's Fourth Annual Report (March, 1970) Community Service and Continuing Education Programs enacted or extended by the 91st Congress:

NEW LEGISLATION

Public Law	Act	Administering Agency	Authorizations 1972
91-219	Veterans Education and Training Amendments Act of 1970	Veterans Administration	
Title I			Open ended
Title II			Open ended
91-230	Education of The Handicapped Act	Office of Education	$ 87,000,000
Title VI, Sec. 631, 632, 634			
91-512	Resource Recovery Act of 1970	HEW	72,000,000
Title I, Sec. 210			unspecified

Public Law	Act	Administering Agency	Authorizations 1972
91-513	Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970	NIMH	
Title I, Sec. 1			$ 12,000,000
Title II, Sec. 502		Attorney General	unspecified
91-516	Environmental Education Act	Office of Environmental Education, USOE	
Section 3			15,000,000
Section 5			15,000,000
91-527	Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970	HEW	
Section 3		Office of Ed.	10,000,000
Section 4		Office of Ed.	10,000,000
91-572	Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970	HEW	
Section 1003		Office of Population Affairs	3,000,000
Section 1005		Office of Population Affairs	1,000,000
91-596	Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970	Department of Labor	
Section 21			Open ended
91-616	Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970	NIMH	
Title IIIB		National Inst. on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	40,000,000
91-648	Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970	Civil Service Commission	
Title III			Open ended

EXTENSION OR REVISION OF PREVIOUS ENACTMENTS

Public Law	Act	Administering Agency	Authorizations 1972
91-346	The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Amendments of 1970	Arts and Humanities Foundation	$ 53,000,000
Section 8			
91-437	Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1970	Corporation for Public Broadcasting	30,000,000

Public Law	Act	Administering Agency	Authorizations 1972
91-515	Heart Disease, Cancer, Stroke, and Kidney Disease Amendments of 1970	Public Health Service	
Title IX	Public Health Service Act		$ 150,000,000
Title III	Public Health Service Act		10,000,000
91-519	Health Training Improvement Act of 1970	Public Health Service	
Title II	Allied Health Professions		55,000,000
91-609	Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970	HUD	
Title III, Section 301			200,000,000
Title III, Section 305			
Title IX, Section 903, 904			
91-644	Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970	Dept. of Justice	1,150,000,000
Title I, Part D			unspecified
Title I, Part E			unspecified

[3] Dr. Charles Andrews expressed reservations about this statement. He pointed out that "many federally supported continuing education programs could very appropriately be administered throu the U.S. Office of Education and State Agencies under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. This concept was initially accepted by the Council in the preparation of this report and the statement as modified does not address the issue of how the role of the Office of Education and State Agencies might be expanded."

STATUS REPORT ON THE COUNCIL'S REVIEW OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

"The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports....to the Secretary and to the President." /Public Law 89-329, 79 Stat. 1223, Sec. 109(c)/ In the Federal government, formal programs designed to educate men and women have proliferated until they are now to be found in virtually every unit of the Executive Branch. Some are intended for the public at large, some for special categories of citizens (businessmen, labor leaders, residents of Appalachia, prisoners, or others), and some for government employees. Some are problem-oriented, dealing with health, welfare, housing or urban life. Some disseminate special content such as agriculture, nutrition, industrial management, the arts, or the humanities. Some are designed to assist various institutions, such as public and private schools, colleges and universities, public libraries, or voluntary citizen groups. Some are administered directly by the Federal government, and some are supported by various types of financial grants made to States, local governments, regions, or institutions. In all of this vast variety of program proliferation, the plain fact is that nobody is now able to look with any clear and coherent view at the total Federal funding and provision of post-secondary adult education.

Early in 1971, steps were taken to assure the completion of a thorough government-wide study upon which many future recommendations of the Council will be based.

A plan of work was developed in January and a nation-wide search was begun for a capable person to work under direction of the Council to achieve the objectives of the proposed study.

Mr. Edward A. Kieloch, an experienced public administrator with detailed knowledge of the Washington scene, was selected from among numerous candidates for the post of Director. He began his service to the Council thirty (30) days before the submission of this report. The comprehensive study of all federally funded extension and continuing education programs is now underway by the Council and its staff.

Among the purposes of the study is that of identifying the agencies, programs, participating institutions, and statutory authorities, that relate to the total task. The study is designed to determine the relative effectiveness of existing programs in terms of the importance of their objectives, the degree to which their objectives are being met, and the duplications or omissions that militate against a comprehensive and coordinated program of Federal support for significant national needs in the field.

65-011 O - 71 - 3

The ultimate goal of the study, and its various component investigations, is that of enabling the Council to speak authoritatively on all aspects of Federal support for continuing education, recommend desirable changes in law, propose useful alterations in agency policies and practices, and relate its interests effectively to institutional, Congressional and Presidential concerns.

The timetable for the study calls for completion of initial data collection and summary report by August 1, 1971. Second stage studies will be completed by November 1, 1971, and by January 1, 1972, the Council will have developed a design for studies, projects and activities that will be conducted on a continuing basis to keep data current and to identify new issues as, or before, they emerge. The Council is encouraged and pleased by these developments and their promise.

In performing its review function, the Council is taking a significant step to provide a comprehensive view of developments in this field and is building a base upon which to fashion a clear national policy for continuing education. This initial effort, however, prepares the way for wide-ranging investigations, policy discussions and actions by the Council, by Federal program administrators, Congress and the Executive Branch, and by individuals and associations. The Council proposes to fulfill its mandated role by taking an increasingly active part in this whole process of policy development.

THE COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAM IN 1970

Appended to this Report is a report to the Council of activities conducted under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The objective of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program (Title I, HEA of 1965) is to provide assistance in the solution of community problems through the utilization of specially designed college and university programs of community service and continuing education. The Council was sufficiently impressed by this document and our own observations of the program's positive accomplishments that we included among our recommendations a number of proposals to enlarge the program and to use its existence for the furtherance of several related Federal initiatives in community education.

The Council is pleased to note the steady maturation of this program which assists colleges and universities in their quest for meaningful involvement of students and professors in service to their communities. The program is having a significant impact upon the reform and renewal of higher education's outreach function and upon strengthening the problem-solving process in communities large and small. Colleges and communities are working together under the program to attack urgent problems related to environment and ecology, urban and rural blight, local government operations and services, and other critical community needs.

Providing college and university assistance toward the solution of specific community problems has characterized and continues to distinguish the program from a variety of seemingly similar and better known problem-oriented pieces of legislation. More importantly, however, what is also becoming apparent is that Title I, HEA of 1965, is a useful tool in dealing with problems within higher education itself-reforming it, revitalizing it and enabling and encouraging its faculty and students to respond effectively to the community's need for problem-solving assistance.

The need for this kind of campus reform is considered essential, desirable and urgent by leaders in education, the private sector and government. Furthermore, the Community Service and Continuing Education Program under Title I, HEA of 1965, stands presently as the Federal government's most appropriate, if not its only tool, for advocating, and triggering such reform and improving in the same process the quality of life in American communities.

As community problems grow increasingly complex and students strengthen their demand for enriched and "relevant" learning experiences, the need for focusing faculty and student resources on the community's problem-solving process becomes more critical than ever before. In light of the need and the demonstrated effectiveness of Title I, HEA of 1965, we strongly urge more realistic levels of funding for this program.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In a year marked by severe budget restraints and rigorous re-examination of educational priorities, the Council is pleased that the continuing education and community service needs of the nation have not suffered irreparable damage. Congressional activities and Administration discussions clearly point to a growing recognition of adult education imperatives and the role they could play in assuring improved economic health and social cohesion.

It is especially propitious that during a time when relatively few new dollars are available for expanding old programs or creating new ones, the Council is engaged in a study of the total Federal effort in post secondary adult education designed to identify outmoded approaches, overlapping programs and overlooked needs. By this time next year, data will be available to facilitate the process of consolidating and streamlining this effort in ways that will substantially enlarge support in high priority areas without requiring equally large increases in the total number of dollars presently being spent.

The Council looks forward to its growing responsibilities and opportunities to assist in the achievement of national goals with respect to higher education in service to the country's adult citizens.

APPENDIX

THE REPORT ON COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SECTION A: STATE PROGRAMS - FISCAL YEAR 1970

SECTION B: REVIEW OF STATE OPERATIONS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

I. Number and Type of Participating Institutions by Fiscal Year

II. Distribution of Federal Program Funds by Type of Participating Institution by Fiscal Year

III. Number of Projects by Geographic Area Served

IV. Distribution of Federal Funds by Geographic Area Served

V. Number of Projects by Problem Area

VI. Distribution of Federal and Local Program Funds by Problem Area

VII. Federal Allotments by State for Fiscal Year 1970

VIII. Distribution of Community Service and Continuing Education Projects Completed, In Progress, and Planned FY 1970

IX. Length of Institutional Grants for CSCE Projects Completed in FY 1970

X. Primary Educational Activity of CSCE Projects Completed in FY 1970

XI. Summary of Continuing Application, CSCE Projects Completed in FY 1970

XII. Summary of Disposition of Proposals Received by State Agencies, FY 1970

XIII. Source of Matching Funds for CSCE Projects Completed in FY 1970

XIV. Administrative Expenditures, By State, FY 1970

XV. Continuing Financial Support for CSCE Projects Initiated Under Title I, HEA of 1965

XVI. Unexpended Project Funds, FY 1970

A REPORT ON
COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS
(Under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965)

Section A - State Programs: Fiscal Year 1970

1. Purpose

The Community Service and Continuing Education (CSCE) Program as authorized under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-329) enables the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to States to strengthen the community service programs of colleges and universities. This was not intended as an end in itself but for the explicit "... purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems ...." The Act does not restrict the types of problems which institutions of higher education may assist the people to solve, but does indicate some of the problem areas which Congress had in mind, such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use.

In defining community service under the Act as an "educational program, activity, or service, including a research program," Title I keeps college and university involvement in community problem solving within the parameters of the generally accepted mission and functions of higher education in the United States --- teaching, research and public service. The Act does not demand that colleges and universities violate or ignore their traditional roles and become master problem-solvers. It simply encourages institutions of higher education, through specially designed education programs to assist the people in the solution of community problems. This has resulted in the creation of partnerships in problem-solving between the colleges and communities participating in the program.

Within this context then the basic mission of Title I, HEA 1965, is to strengthen the community service programs of colleges and universities, by encouraging the design of educational programs that assist people to solve community problems and by developing community service as a major function of this country's institutions of higher education.

2. Administration of the Program

The CSCE program is administered as a State operation under a State Plan prepared by a State Agency in each State and approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The State Agency in each State, assisted by advisory councils, establishes priorities among problem areas, approves all project proposals from colleges and universities, and allots available

resources to conduct the approved projects. While the State Agency assumes a significant and active role, the U.S. Office of Education provides consultation and exercises leadership in improving program performance and encouraging activities designed to meet national needs. One third of total program cost must be met with non-Federal funds. The program is conducted in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

3. General Developments

In its budget justification the Community Service and Continuing Education Branch in the U.S. Office Education (CSCE Branch) designated Fiscal Year 1970 as "The Year of Transition" for CSCE programming. Experience gained during four fiscal years of operation, coupled with an increasingly clearer perception of community problems and national priorities, led to renewed efforts on the part of the CSCE Branch to use Title I funds to promote the goals of the enabling legislation, i.e., strengthening the community service programs of participating colleges and universities and concurrently helping communities to solve problems. The primary thrust was to develop ways to get more colleges and universities committed to long range community service by encouraging them to develop institution-wide procedures, reorder institutional priorities and change attitudes with regard to community involvement and public responsibility.

Although assistance in the solution of community problems is still the ultimate goal of the CSCE program, the major thrust in FY 1970 was that of seeking ways of optimizing the impact of Title I on higher education by enabling it to provide more relevant participation in community problem-solving service for its faculty and students. The CSCE Branch and State Agencies united in the "transition" by using more of the limited Title I funds to promote fewer but broader programs aimed at strengthening the community service dimension of higher education, leading to institution-wide involvement in the community and to long term commitments to the provision of problem-solving assistance.

The number of projects did continue to decrease, although not dramatically, from a high of 721 in 1968, to 653 in 1969 and 610 in FY 1970. As in the year before, the State Agencies were faced with project proposals requiring funds exceeding by several million the $9.5 million in Federal funds available, making the approval process most difficult.

In addition to continuing the funding of long-range projects initiated and reported last year, such as the Urban Observatory program in 10 cities, the Community Governance Project in Washington, D.C. and the Cleveland State Community Extension program, new inter-institutional, inter-disciplinary, institution-wide programs aimed at extending higher education resources to assist in the solution of community problems were developed. Examples of these programs are the Memphis State Urban

Extension program, a Denver consortium of seven colleges and universities, a Higher Education Council on Urban Affairs (HECUA) of 19 institutions in Baltimore, and a consortium of six institutions in North Carolina directed toward environmental problems.

All of these new CSCE projects had one characteristic in common: to demonstrate that a comprehensive, coordinated, and concerted approach is more feasible in providing long-range assistance in the solution of community problems than is a short-term, one-time project approach. At the same time the programs aimed at strengthening, in the process, the teaching, research and public service functions of the participating institutions.

In addition, increased attention was given by the CSCE Branch and State Agencies to the need for responding to national problem priorities. This was reflected in funding more programs than in the past addressed to environmental and ecological education, crises in the inner cities (including assistance to Model Cities programs), drug abuse, crime, delinquency, and the needs of special groups such as women and the disadvantaged. (Specific programs in these areas are covered below in item 8 of this section).

Fiscal Year 1970, therefore, was a year in which more effort than in the past was given to new and long-range programs designed to relate the resources of higher education to the very complex process of solving community problems. It was a year devoted to strengthening institutional community service programs, eliciting institution-wide commitments, utilizing students in volunteer action programs, and helping to give the public service function of colleges and universities an image of prestige traditionally reserved only for teaching and research functions.

4. Participating Colleges and Universities

A total of 501 institutions of higher education participated in planning and conducting Title I HEA projects during FY 1970. This was an increase of 47 over FY 1969 and 207 more than participated in the first year of the program. Public institutions, as in prior years, accounted for most of the participating institutions (320 or 64%), administered the largest number of programs (463) and received the major share of Federal funds (78%). Two year colleges received 9.3% of the funds, slightly higher than in FY 1969. The fact that more institutions contributed to fewer total projects than in 1969, is attributed to the growing number of consortium arrangements.

Tables I and II show the number of institutions and the distribution of Federal funds by type of institution for Fiscal Years 1967 through 1970.

65-011 O - 71 - 4

22 IS S

5. The People Served

Statistics on the number of people benefited in a program such as Title I of the HEA 1965 are next to impossible to obtain. For example, projects to improve government services can be said to benefit the entire population of a community, and a land use planning program may have equally broad impact upon vast numbers of citizens. A reasonably close estimate, however, of the number of persons who actually receive direct educational, counselling, or consultative assistance can be made. In this regard the State Agencies reported that more than 800,000 people were direct recipients of educational services and those reached indirectly through the mass media numbered in excess of 5 million persons under FY 1970 projects.

Men and women in all age and occupational categories have been recipitents of the educational services provided through programs supported from Title I funds. Programs in Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit and Cleveland, for example, have benefited inner-city blacks; programs in North Dakota and Alabama have helped small businessmen; while human relations programs in various States have assisted many and varied groups better relate to their communities and fellow citizens.

6. Financing the Program

To finance the 610 projects conducted by 501 participating institutions, States, local communities and the institutions of higher education provided $5.9 million to match the $8.487 million in project grants. Another $985,000 in Federal funds matched by about $490,000 in local funds were expended by the State agencies for State administration. Thus the States exceeded their required match of 33-1/3 percent of the Federal allotment by about $1.65 million.

Federal allotments by State for Fiscal Year 1970 are shown in Table VII.

7. Focus on Urban and Suburban Problems

Community service programs under Title I during FY 1970 continued to give special emphasis to urban and suburban problems as required by the enabling Act. A total of 284 projects (47%) were conducted in urban areas; 61 projects (10%) were conducted in urban-suburban areas; and 199 (32%) were conducted that are classed as comprehensive in nature covering large regions, including some on a statewide basis. Many of the projects in the latter categories were frequently related to urban problems such as pollution, health, housing, human relations, crime and delinquency, governmental services, and drug abuse. Programs in the urban and suburban areas accounted for 61% of the Federal Title I funds with 29% going into regional or statewide programs which included urban and suburban areas.

Projects oriented toward the rural areas numbered 66 (11%) in FY 1970, eight more than in FY 1969 and required 10% of the Federal Title I funds. They were aimed at economic, cultural, health, environmental and governmental problems in the rural areas. A prime example of serving the rural area was a project activated in FY 1970 by the West Virginia Institute of Technology for incorporating the many small towns extending for a thirty mile area from Charleston to Gauley Bridge into one governmental unit. This should make it possible to provide the people of the area with needed governmental services more efficiently and effectively.

Regional or statewide projects focused on health needs and services, projects dealing with the environment, and programs dealing with economic improvement.

Specific projects are identified in the following section while Tables III and IV indicate the number of projects and distribution of Federal funds in terms of geographic area served during Fiscal Years 1967 through 1970.

8. Community Problems and Exemplary Programs

The enabling legislation listed nine problem areas to which the resources of higher education might be addressed through Title I programs: housing, poverty, government, recreation employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use. The States and USOE have added other areas of concern: community development, human relations, personal development and economic development. Tables V and VI show the number of programs and dollars spent in these problem areas during Fiscal Years 1967 through 1970. Within these general areas special attention was given in 1970 to environmental-ecological problems, inner city decay (including Model Cities), drugs, crime and delinquency.

These programs were jointly planned by colleges and their communities, and frequently involved cooperation among private as well as Federal, State and local government agencies. A few of the more important areas of concern in FY 1970 programming were:

a. Environment and Ecology Education

This is one of three special areas receiving emphasis from the CSCE national staff as requested by the U.S. Office of Education's Management by Objective Plan. A total of 82 projects related to this problem were funded in FY 1970, absorbing $1.073 million (11%) of the Federal Title I program funds. Significant projects included seven statewide

24 85

community environmental education efforts started in Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Vermont and Washington utilizing a systematic approach to reach large numbers of citizens throughout each state. An international award-winning film was produced in the Vermont program, entitled "A Thousand Hills." Maine's 1970 program is aimed at air pollution following a concentrated citizen education project in proper land use and water pollution which culminated in the enactment in FY 1970 of a statewide $50 million bond issue for facilities to help solve the water pollution problem.

Other programs in the general environmental problems category ranged from "goals formulation" programs in Arizona, Louisiana, New Mexico and Tennessee to neighborhood, community and regional planning efforts in no less than 29 states. Unique among the projects was a population problem program in Hawaii; an inland waterway for ocean transport project in Georgia; a mined-land reclamation program in Montana; an environmental sanitation education project for rural Tennessee; and the development of a model on environmental issues of urban America in Philadelphia.

b. Inner City-Decay

America's ghettos abound with disgraceful deterioration. The importance the CSCE Branch placed on this urban problem in 1970 can be noted in projects in cooperation with the national Model Cities Program. The Model Cities concept is one of coordinating all of the social, economic and physical program activities for 150 chosen demonstration areas around the U.S. through a local central agency. Since 1967, when the Model Cities Program became operable, Title I, HEA projects have provided education and training dimensions in 73 of the 150 model cities areas. The projects were formulated in cooperation with local residents and the local City Demonstration Agency (CDA) in each city.

The target of the CSCE staff is to have input into at least half of the Model Cities areas by FY 1972. This appears to be well on schedule.

In FY 1970 37 CSCE programs were funded in 45 Model Cities areas. In Michigan and Texas, CSCE programs provided technical assistance and special training through higher education institutions to all Model Cities under one coordinated program in each State. Eight cities were involved in each of these States. Other Model Cities areas and their respective activities shown in parenthesis, which were Title I, HEA coordinated through the local CDA's action plan and reported for the first time in 1970 included: Perth Amboy, New Jersey (educational planning); Philadelphia (courses for advisory boards and committees); Little Rock, Arkansas (goal seminars); Rock Island, Illinois (seminars and training for residents); Fargo, North Dakota (employment skills training); Boise, Idaho (youth opportunities planning); Norfolk and Richmond, Virginia (leadership and group dynamics training); Winston-Salem, North Carolina (coordinating faculty and student skills); San Diego, California (technical assistance and action research); Indianapolis, Indiana (student volunteer corps and faculty assistance); Kansas City, Kansas (business education); St. Louis, Missouri (simulation exercises and leadership training); Rochester (Inner-city Education Centers) and Syracuse, New York (seminars on race relations); and Dayton, Ohio (economic education seminars).

Many more CSCE programs were conducted to alleviate the inner city problems of our nation than those represented in the Model Cities Program. The CSCE Branch continues to place emphasis on activities for deteriorating inner city neighborhoods even though other national and Federal programs especially designed to cope with inner-city decay have been initiated. Most of these latter programs, however, do not provide for an adequate educational effort, and Title I HEA helps to supplement those programs' need for educational assistance. In FY 1970 the major CSCE program emphases in the District of Columbia, California and Illinois were directed to this specific concern. All had programs to improve the quality of life in the ghetto through technical assistance and counseling, special courses and remedial education centers, including a unique mobile advisement center in Los Angeles, and business, employment and occupational skills training.

c. Problems of the Disadvantaged

This represents the third area of special emphasis by the National Staff of Title I, HEA. The States' response to this emphasis is evidenced by the fact that Title I, HEA projects directed toward disadvantaged persons and groups were funded in every State in FY 1970. The participants of educational activities included members of minority groups and handicapped individuals. Programs covered all types of people in projects such as special business and leadership skills training for black-Americans in the District of Columbia, Mississippi and Connecticut; continuing education workshops for American Indians in Arizona, California and Alaska; special courses for Mexican-Americans in California; Cubans in Florida; Puerto Ricans in New York, Illinois and Connecticut; Asians in California; and French-Canadians residing in New Hampshire. Also included are special education projects for the educationally handicapped in South Carolina and Ohio; resource development for low income persons in Nebraska and Utah; remedial education for disadvantaged youths and dropouts in New Mexico and Florida; special extension courses for convicts in South Carolina, West Virginia and Connecticut; and special studies and training for the unemployed in North Dakota and Oklahoma.

d. Community Crises

Among the social crises tormenting the urban areas, drug abuse, crime, delinquency, and health problems are notable. An increasing number of programs have been developed in these areas.

Typical of the programs on drug abuse developed in FY 1970 are the following: Connecticut sponsored three programs, two of which were summer institutes on the effects of drugs; a program in Georgia trained resource people for community drug abuse programs; a consortium of community colleges in Maryland conducted a statewide symposium on the abuse of drugs in colleges and communities; Massachusetts had a program on the reshaping of policies on drugs and drug abuse; a number of other States sponsored projects of information on the effects of drugs.

To curb the spread of crime and delinquency, programs for young people were developed. Among others, Hawaii sponsored a seminar on juvenile delinquency involving the youth, lawyers, teachers and graduate students. Kentucky had an in-service training project for juvenile delinquency counselors. In New Jersey, 15 students were involved with young people at a Community Youth Center to determine how the University and the community can better serve youth. New Mexico had a program wherein students served as tutors for dropouts from schools. Ohio held a seminar for 100 elected local government officials in juvenile delinquency prevention.

Rhode Island again ran a pre-matriculation summer program for high-risk students (mostly black) who could not qualify for admission to any college. The 94 students participating were enrolled in Rhode Island State colleges and their expenses are being paid by the State. Virginia sponsored a workshop to train student volunteers for community services, namely for tutoring the educationally disadvantaged, mental patients, and the aged. Vermont had a program to assist the city of Rutland in expanding opportunities for disadvantaged youth.

In FY 1970, 20 States initiated 44 projects designed to improve community and personal health standards. Among the educational programs were those dealing with mental health, the training of nurses aides and public health administrators.

Connecticut sponsored 4 projects to train employable women as health aides. Georgia had a program for aides in the rehabilitation of the trainable mentally retarded. Iowa held conferences for State, county, and local government officials on water pollution and sanitation, as well as a course in middle management for nurses in hospitals. Massachusetts established a Model Community Medical Institute to train public health administrators. New Jersey established a mobile cardiac unit training program to train emergency medical technicians. Pennsylvania organized a course for parents of retarded children.

Puerto Rico initiated a program to train students for field work in the use and abuse of drugs and medicaments. South Carolina updated hospital and public health personnel in the efficient use of medical facilities and Virginia had a program on psychiatric nursing.

Common to all of these projects was a basic concern on the part of community leaders and residents, as well as university personnel, to cope with the problems that shatter individual lives and spoil the quality of family and community life.

e. Inefficient Government

Ameliorating the inefficiencies of government remained a major activity of the program. During FY 1970, 90 projects were activated in the problem area of government.

The training of State and local government employees for more efficient performance of their duties was an increasingly popular activity. Maine and Hawaii have established and are still sponsoring career development programs for governmental employees. Delaware sponsored fire and police training programs. Georgia had a seminar for municipal managers, an educational program on State and local government, and a seminar on the Georgia legislative process for its community leaders. Idaho ran a seminar for the members of its State legislature. Kentucky had an educational course and gave technical assistance to 45 municipal governments. Louisiana had an educational project for newly elected State officials and a seminar on environment for governmental officials and employees. Tennessee had a course aimed at developing the competence of 100 property assessors, a course for county court members, a project to provide technical assistance and consulting services for municipal officials, and a community forum and workshop to discuss governance and citizen participation. Texas initiated 10 programs in government, including: intern assistance to local governments; a workshop for county government officials; in-career development for municipal clerks and secretaries; an inter-governmental community conference program; and an educational program for local and regional policy makers. Virginia sponsored a public discussion program of pros and cons in reference to a referendum regarding a new State Constitution to provide people with information essential in making intelligent policy decisions.

These kinds of experiences, fostered and refined under Title I, should be of great value as the Federal government begins to implement the Intergovernmental

Personnel Act of 1970. It is also possible, and very useful, to take advantage of the existing mechanism of State Agency administrators to assist in the identification of statewide training needs and the development of statewide plans.

9. Methods of Attack

The CSCE Branch, State agencies, and institutions have experimented with new methods of attacking the diverse community problems. In addition to the traditional types of programs such as specially designed seminars, conferences, and continuing education courses, the development and demonstration of new mechanisms are being tried to find the most efficient and effective means of applying Title I dollars to fulfill the mandate of the Act. Among these newer methods or arrangements are community centers, consortia, urban agents, the urban observatory, action research and student-faculty task forces. Among the more important of these concepts utilized in 1970 were:

a. Consortium Arrangements for Pooling Resources

Consortia type arrangements are proving to be useful vehicles for applying a broad range of higher education resources and competencies to common problems in large areas. A Colorado Title I Consortium of seven member schools are pooling their expertise and directing it toward community leadership development and related programs to improve governmental and community service in a large area of the State. The Consortium also provides the vehicle for Colorado's participation in the Denver Urban Observatory. In addition, the consortium has initiated a project to assist in securing public acceptance for the role of institutions of higher education in the solution of community problems, and the development of new procedures for the solution and prevention of community problems.

In the Greater Baltimore, Maryland area, a consortium of 19 institutions referred to as the Higher Education Council on Urban Affairs (HECUA) provides a mechanism for conducting workshops and small group sessions with representatives from the community, city agencies, and higher education. A major contribution being made by HECUA is providing free courses for low income groups in subjects requested by them, coupled with technical assistance

65-011 O - 71 - 5

provided by the colleges and universities to community agencies. It is also the vehicle for Title I participation in the Baltimore Urban Observatory.

A North Carolina consortium has been organized to provide a statewide environmental education program. Its objective is to inform and educate teachers and citizens about environmental problems and solutions to those problems through the integrated use of workshops, seminars, printed materials, newsletters, ETV programs, and on-site techniques.

These are but a few examples through which inter-institutional and inter-disciplinary programs can be developed to respond more effectively to community needs.

b. Community Service Centers

Community service centers that draw on college faculty and students to provide information service, counseling, seminars, classes and technical assistance for community residents have been established with more than 130 colleges and universities involved in their operation. The centers actually try to match the community needs or requests with appropriate academic unit(s) of the institution and thereby make it possible to apply to a single community problem the expertise of the institution's many disciplines. The services provided at the centers include tutoring, college advisement, management courses for small businesses, health information service, help in land use planning, economic development and cultural enrichment. While benefiting ghetto residents, the centers are also giving the faculty and students a chance to be exposed to conditions in poverty neighborhoods where their human and academic skills can be tested and improved.

More than 100 such centers have been initiated with Title I funds. In FY 1970 twenty nine (29) new centers were funded in 25 communities. Among those activated in 1970 was the "Mobile Advisement Center" of the Los Angeles City College designed to provide a mobile educational/vocational counseling service to citizens, primarily Chicanos and Blacks. It is staffed by professional counselors, assisted by trained minority students.

In 1970, the Indiana Institute of Technology established a group of neighborhood contact centers using inner-city residents to explain to neighborhood groups and organizations what institutional resources are available and how they can be utilized in the community.

Southern University established two "Cooperative Urban Store-Front Extension Centers" in New Orleans. These centers provide informational services and educational programs for residents of the lower income areas of New Orleans. A channel of communications between the community and the university is being developed.

The North Dakota State University established an "Employment Services Center" in Fargo to provide workshops, seminars, conferences and courses for persons moving from the rural areas to the city and to improve the employment opprotunities of residents of the Fargo Model Cities Area.

These are only a few of the centers developed through Title I, HEA funding but they demonstrate one very important method of making the higher education institutions more relevant to the needs and interest of their communities.

c. <u>The Urban Agent As a University Resource</u>

This method is one of testing the application of the county agent concept developed by the Department of Agriculture to the inner-city area. The "urban agent" serves as the university's contact with the community and utilizes personal and institutional resources to help alleviate the problems of the city.

A good example of this experimental method is seen in the Community Extension Program of Cleveland State University. The "urban agent", in partnership with members of the community, develops programs requested by the community utilizing appropriate resources of Cleveland State University. In 1970, Cleveland State's urban agent was able to expand and intensify the development and delivery of educational programs for businessmen in the black community; to establish a resource pool of persons to assist businesmen; and to investigate sources of funding other than Title I for these educational services. The same urban agent initiated a cooperative citizen education

program whose objectives are to identify and train citizens interested in examining concepts and strategies related to community management, evaluate educational programs, and establish a resource pool from which community leaders can obtain help in the implementation of their education and action plans.

A similar program was developed at Memphis State University in 1970 which is in fact an "Urban Action Center" that is now re-assessing the university's resources and working actively with the community to solve all types of urban problems. These programs are too new to offer measurable and definitive results. It is clear thus far that the complexities of community problems and the wide range of integrated resources that are needed for their solution presents greater difficulties than the relatively simple procedure of the agricultural agent who applies a single discipline to a particular industry. Nontheless, further experimentation will prove useful.

d. Urban Observatory

The Urban Observatory (U.O.) program is an experimental concept being tried in a network of ten cities distributed across the nation. It seeks to utilize college and university competence through basic and applied research and community service activities, while at the same time creating alliances of local governments and institutions of higher education to help meet the needs of local officials in solving urban problems. Six of the cities were named in FY 1969 (Albuquerque, Atlanta, Baltimore, Kansas City, Milwaukee and Nashville) and the remaining four in FY 1970 (Boston, Cleveland, Denver and San Diego). In FY 1970, most of the CSCE projects funded for the U.O. program became operational, including seven FY 1969 funded projects. It should be noted that the normal procedures for approving Title I, HEA proposals by the respective State agencies still apply. A total of 19 varied projects of community service nature were funded during FY 1970. These 19 projects along with the six funded in 1969 absorbed over $500,000 in Federal Title I funds. Local match accounted for over $250,000 additional monies for the projects.

These Title I, HEA dollars are coordinated with research grants totaling about $75,000 per city from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, matched by about 10% in local monies, which go to make up the combined dollar effort to attack an agreed-upon national and local agenda of problems. It is primarily the local agenda items that the Title I, HEA dollars support in community service educational activities. Examples of these funded in FY 1970 were: Albuquerque (seminars in planning); Atlanta (a series of courses for leaders and government representatives); Baltimore (The HECUA Service Project); Boston (special training in principles and techniques of PPBS, and a training program of citizen involvement in low cost housing rehabilitation); Cleveland (a housing workshop and special assistance to local economic development corporations); Denver (leadership development activities); Kansas City, Kansas (helping minority businesses and leadership); Kansas City, Missouri (training of government and community leaders); Milwaukee (government leadership training); Nashville (community leadership training for government and community leaders and public policy seminars); and San Diego (training of government and community leaders with student resources involvement).

In addition, two urban observatory type projects were funded in FY 1970 with Title I, HEA funds only. One was in Washington, D.C., with a project entitled "The Community Governance Program." The second was the "Development of an Urban Observatory" project in Providence, Rhode Island. Both of these are planned as long term efforts.

e. Student/Faculty Task Forces

Although there can be student/faculty involvement in many "methods of attack" the use of student/faculty task forces (volunteerism) can be singled out as a "method" in itself The following are some examples in which students and faculty members have joined forces to provide services to meet critical community needs. An interesting project using students and faculty for assisting the community in solving its problems is one initiated by San Francisco State College. The institution has planned a four-year curriculum which will provide academic credit to students who work for community organizations for twenty hours a week. The project will provide student manpower in the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino

sections of San Francisco. It will match community needs and college resources.

In the District of Columbia, the Youth Manpower Development project utilizes students who aid in counseling the "hard-core" young and adult dropouts. Another project in the District "The Community Governance Program," utilizes students and faculty to serve on working groups that make recommendations to improve government services. In New Mexico a project calls for students under faculty guidance to provide assistance at the State Hospital, to the Young Citizens for Action group, and to other agencies and needy individuals as well. In Texas a project uses graduate student interns, under faculty guidance, to work with and provide consultative services to local government officials.

It should be noted that action research has been utilized with some projects in all of the above methods. It is the CSCE Branch's observation that there is a trend toward funding more projects with an action research orientation. The extent of this trend and the impact of such projects have not yet been determined.

10. Conclusion

Fiscal Year 1970 was indeed the "Year of Transition" for the Community Service and Continuing Education Programs under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In spite of the fact that January 1970 found the State agencies and CSCE Branch faced with the trauma of having been deleted from the Federal budget recommendations for 1971, the program continued unabated. Measures were taken to increase the impact that higher education can have on community problems. Long-range projects were increasing while the short term one day conference types were decreasing. More demonstration or "model" projects were being undertaken to interrelate and apply higher education resources to the communities around them. The National office and the States began putting more emphasis on problem priorities of national concern such as environmental-ecological problems, community crises problems (drug, health, crime and delinquency), problems relating to women, and problems relating to minorities and the disadvantaged. By now there is no question that if provided with proper financial and technical support the community service arm of colleges and universities can make important contributions toward the solution of the varied community problems facing America today.

The examples in item 8 above, although impressive in spite of the modest financial input, when coupled with the "methods of attack" identified in item 9 do demonstrate the contributions that resources of institutions of higher education can make in the community problem-solving process and indicate some methods used for creating permanent partnerships between "town and gown" during FY 1970.

This is examined more fully in the following Section which is an analysis of State operations. It suggests some areas of weakness in program development and administration that deserve attention at State and national levels. The review also identifies some areas of strength and promising practices which can be useful in further refinement of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program.

Section B-Review of State Operations

Introduction

This Section of the Annual Report summarizes a preliminary assessment of the national program of Community Service and Continuing Education in terms of the goals of the enabling legislation, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965:

-to assist in the solution of community problems.

-to strengthen the community service programs of colleges and universities.

These thrusts are reciprocal and mutually reinforcing processes. They are isolated from one another only for the purpose of measuring the impact of the program.

Each participating State administers the program through a designated State agency pursuant to a state plan. This agency establishes priorities, approves and funds projects, receives and prepares reports. Therefore, any attempt to assess program impact must necessarily include a review of state administrative practices.

Data on which this report is based was obtained from Annual Program Reports and Financial Statements submitted by the States for Fiscal Year 1970, state-wide evaluation documents, selected project reviews and a questionnaire survey of State Administrators.

The concept of an "Operational Year" is used to focus on both state administrative activity and project performance. An "Operational Year" is a twelve-month period in which plans made, activities conducted, assessments completed and reports filed are viewed as constituting the State Operation. The operational year employed in this review is July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970. This time-frame concept should provide a basis for future attempts to discover "what happened." In the past our view of the CSCE Program has been geared to fiscal year of funding - a limitation has severely hampered efforts to assess program impact at the National level.

There are limitations to an "Operational Review" based on questionnaires and reporting forms. Unclear questions, inadequate instructions and late/no response are error-contributing factors in self-reporting schemes.

While useful in many ways such data gathering must be supplemented by on site visitation from Office of Education staff to increase the accuracy of findings and recommendations that flow from them.

State administrators have been most cooperative in this effort particularly in contributing information often on very short notice.

The Operational Year of 1970

State programs of Community Service and Continuing Education encompassed 1359 community - assisting projects in 51* States. A total of 719 projects were "in progress" and 184 projects were "planned" with implementation scheduled for the year ahead (See Table VIII). Of the 719 projects in progress, 54% were funded in Fiscal Years 1966-69, while the remaining 45% were approved and began operation in the Fiscal Year 1970. Of the 184 projects scheduled to get underway after June 30, 1970, four had been approved for funding in Fiscal Year 1969.

The 456 projects reported as completed comprise 33.5% of project activity in this year. The term "completed" is synonymous with "end-of-grant" as used in this report and as applied by the States in their evaluations and reports. This section deals with that group of completed projects in terms of a set of critical factors: length of project, primary educational activity, institutional resource use, community cooperation and continuing application of higher education and/or community resources.

The length of institutional grants for projects completed in 1970 was 21 months on the average. The States, in the original funding of these projects, had approved an average operational period of 10.9 months. Thus, the actual time to completion for the majority of projects in most States is twice as long as had been anticipated. A state-by-state comparison appears in Table IX.

State Agencies notified the Office of Education of time extensions or other revisions in 32.5% of the 438 projects reported as completed in 1970. A variety of reasons are given for extending grant periods, among the most common are: faculty departures, difficulty in obtaining matching funds, recruitment of participants, and changes in program design or shifts in program objective. Other factors have been identified and will be discussed in a later section of this report.

New projects, or first-time efforts, account for 57.3% of projects reported as completed. The remaining 42.7% projects were continuations of activities undertaken in earlier years. Projects completing a second year of funding number 158, while 29 projects had been in operation from three to five years.

---

*Annual Reports were not received from Alaska, New Jersey, and Guam.

Methods and procedures employed in the conduct of university community service programs reflect, in part, institutional orientation to community problem solving as well as community expectations.

Of the 416 projects for which data is available, the primary educational activity is determined to be a "course" (See Table X). Conferences and one-day meetings comprise the next largest categories of activity. Technical assistance, research, and information dissemination are reported in that order of frequency. It is recognized that more than one activity of the above categorization may occur in a particular community service program. The focus here is on primary educational activity. Further analysis reveals a set of projects that must be described as "comprehensive". Comprehensive programs comprise 8% of projects completed.

An example from the New York State Program will serve to illustrate the concept of comprehensiveness. The establishment of an "Educational-Vocational Counseling System for Adults" involved simultaneous and interrelated activities. Eight colleges and universities cooperated in the organization of a broadly-based community agency. This agency, through its constituent members: (1) published a Directory of Career Information which was distributed to 500 agencies and institutions, (2) established a task force on "Higher Education and the Poor" and (3) held conferences related to the improvement of the New York State High School Equivalency Testing Program.

The question of project initiation, i.e. who has an idea or identifies a problem and takes the necessary steps to begin the development process, deserves greater attention at State and national levels. Although critical, this area is difficult to assess at the national level. The responses of 34 State administrators indicate that University faculty are the prime movers. Of the 420 projects for which data was provided 41.9% were initiated by faculty alone. Faculty members are indicated as co-initiators in 77 additional projects. Community groups account for some 7% while State and local governments initiated 6% and "multiple initiators" were reported for 25% of the projects completed in 1970. Two States reported one project each which was initiated by university students.

The consideration of institutional resource use at this point is restricted to faculty and student involvement in the operation of projects completed in 1970. Reference is made later in this report to the financial contributions of institutions of higher education as a resource for community service. More than half of the states report that the level of faculty participation is about the same as in 1969, while one third of the States report increased involvement by college and university faculty. While no adequate assessment may be made of faculty contributions, the majority serve as project directors and/or instructors.

College students as an institutional resource for community services have only recently received the attention they deserve. In most States students performed a variety of roles in a wide-range of project activity.

Students generally serve as instructors, researchers and technical assistants.

An adequate assessment of the contributions of cooperating community agencies is not possible from available data. Over the years, institutions of higher education have sought and secured cooperation from hundreds of governmental units, community agencies and civic organizations. State administrators were asked to estimate volume of community contributions to projects completed in 1970. A number of State Agencies were unable to respond to this question from records available to them. Their responses indicate that a variety of agencies have provided substantive assistance in Title I projects.

Across the country, the major contribution has been in the recruiting of participants. Such a situation appears reasonable in that it is most frequently the membership or the employees of a cooperating agency for whom the particular project has been designed. Planning with institutions, the provision of instructional staff materials and use of agency facilities are rated in that order by State Administrators. On the whole, very few community agencies participated "in name only."

Available evidence clearly indicates that the current volume of project activity and the increasing number of individuals who benefit is possible only when there is close cooperation between the university and community agencies.

In recognition of the fact that community problems are rarely solved by a single application of university resources, it is useful to review "completed" projects in terms of the continuing application of higher education and/or community resources.

Of the 364 projects reported as "completed" in 1970, 201 will continue to serve with support from a variety of sources. Of those projects continuing in 1971, 55% are to be supported by funds under Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, including fourteen to be consolidated with on-going projects. Twelve projects will receive major revisions prior to re-funding in 1972 or later.

Of the remaining 82 projects, 70 are being continued with funding from the institutions, community agencies and state or local governments. Twelve projects, in ten states, are receiving funds from a variety of Federal programs.

TABLE XI
SUMMARY OF CONTINUING APPLICATION
COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED IN FISCAL YEAR 1970

	Total	Purpose Accomplished	1971 Continuing	1972 Plus	Failed	Other
No. of States Reporting	32	25	26	4	16	6
No. of Projects	364	132	187	14	20	11

Some 20 projects, in 16 states, were judged to be "unsuccessful" and were not to be continued. On the other hand, 132 projects were reported as "purpose accomplished" and therefore required no further support.

The data presented here and in the earlier review of project life-span, taken together begin to dispel the notion of projectitis in the administration of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program. Although further data collection and analysis is required, there is a discernable trend toward State Program development for specific purposes related to long-standing community problems.

State Administration

There have been few changes in the designation of State Agencies for the administration of the Community Service and Continuing Education Program during the period 1966-1970. In the first full year of operation (1967), minor shifts in Agency designation and in personnel assignments were made.

The present designated State Agencies are categorized as follows:

State Universities	21	39.0%
State Boards or Commissions Related to Higher Education	23	42.5%
State Departments of Education	3	5.5%
Other State Departments	7	13.0%
Totals	54	100.0%

It should be noted that in three states - Arizona, Iowa and South Carolina - the State University is the effective administering agency. In each instance the authority has been delegated by the designated State Agency which is a State Board or Council on Higher Education.

While the designation of administrative agency has remained relatively stable over time, the last year has seen unprecedented turn-over in personnel responsible for day-to-day operations. Twenty states have changed administrators and in two other states changes are slated as individuals depart or agencies are re-organized.

The extremely high rate of personnel change is attributed to the uncertainty about funding of and proposed legislative changes in the Program. There are other factors at work within any administrative organization but certainly, the psychological pressure engendered by an "unstable program situation" is a contributing factor.

Policies and Procedures are determined by the States for the operation of the Program with guidance and assistance from the Office of Education. The legislation itself and accompanying Regulations provide the base for developing State Plans, Annual Amendments, operating policies and procedures for implementing policy. The basic documents have been supplemented by Program Memoranda issued and conferences developed by the Community Service and Continuing Education Branch. While personal visitation between Washington and the several states has been restricted, telephone and written communications have flourished.

State guidelines for institutional participation or proposal preparation have been issued by all but five State Agencies (Mississippi, South Dakota, Wyoming, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands). Some states included guidelines in their original State Plan and these remain relatively unchanged.

Guidelines issued by the states range from a one-page "Criteria for Project Approval" to thirty-page documents which are revised annually. There is not necessarily a positive correlation between size of document and its effectiveness. However, the practice of annual revisions would appear to have merit in guiding the development of a comprehensive State Program composed of institutional projects at various stages of their life span.

In the continuing development of the State Program all eligible institutions of higher education are notified of state priorities and invited to submit proposals.

One important factor in this procedure is the time available between notification and date for submission of proposals. There is probably no "ideal" time span that would be acceptable to all or even a majority of institutions. The Oregon Educational Coordinating Council, in its Five-Year Report, proposes to increase the lead time for institutional planning and proposal preparation. This action is being taken "...so that institutions with acceptable proposals will have six months or more to involve the community in the planning process."

The procedures for eliciting institutional participation and improving project performance include several specific categories of action. The techniques most frequently employed are conference-workshop sessions and

regularly issued Newsletters or Bulletins. In the past year, about one-half of the State Agencies held state-wide conferences for institutional representatives and/or project directors and several states also held regional conferences. Three-fourths of the states issued publications on a regular basis. A sampling of these publications reveals that they are informative on national issues and state concerns as well as providing specific instructions to project directors or participating institutions and related State Agencies.

The States have encouraged each college and university to designate a representative for communication with the State Agency. A majority of institutions of higher education have named an individual or an office for this purpose. There is great variety among the administrative units so designated. In smaller institutions, the President or Dean is most frequently designated. In the larger institutions are found Deans of the Graduate School, Summer School, Extension, Continuing Education, and Public Service; Directors of Community Relations, Development; Vice Presidents for Research and Assistants to the President. There are striking differences among the states in the patterns of institutional representation. In such states as Georgia, New York and California all public institutions have established an office for Community Service and Continuing Education although titles of the individuals vary widely.

In the judgments of State Administrators, the presence of institutional representatives has a positive effect on the projects proposed by participating colleges and universities. The greatest value of such offices appears to lie in eliminating duplication of projects proposed from the same institution. They have been least effective in aiding the institution to prepare and submit more comprehensive proposals. Finally, it appears that the presence of an institutional representative does generate more proposals from his college or university.

Problems and Priorities for the development of State Programs over the past five years may be characterized as static. While the Annual Program Amendments reflect a decrease in the number of problem areas, in most states this has been accomplished by employing higher levels of abstraction in problem statements. The statement of State priorities has settled into a comfortable pattern. The pattern is one of adopting global areas of concern such as "Community Development" and "Human Resource Development." These broad statements when unaccompanied by rigorous problem identification provide scant basis for the development of institutional programs to assist in the solution of specific aspects of community problems.

This condition is sometimes defended on the basis that State Agencies wish to meet problems, as they arise, with relevant educational activities. Another line of defense has been drawn in terms of national leadership and national priorities. State administrators cite, in this regard, the enactment of additional categorical legislation that further hinders State efforts at coordination of higher education - based community education activities. The problems identified and the priorities established by and

large speak to critical areas of national concern as they are manifest in local communities. Early program efforts related to drug abuse, environmental quality and minority business, prepared the way for recent decisions by State Agencies and Advisory Councils to assign higher priority to these areas.

Financing the Program is the greatest challenge facing the states and the agencies designated to administer the Community Service and Continuing Education Program.

In fiscal year 1970, more than $8 million in Federal funds was requested by institutions in 33 states over and above the amount allocated to the states in that year. The 392 programs that remained unfunded were developed to meet the States' priorities, eligible under the law and well prepared plans for education action.

TABLE XII

No. of States Reporting	Proposals Received	Approved Funded	Approved Unfunded	Federal Dollars Required
33	1,013	432	392	$8,082,579

In addition, 189 proposals submitted to State Agencies were not approved. In the judgment of State Administrators, Review Panels, and Advisory Councils a substantial number of un-approved proposals speak to problems or concerns that require the resources of higher education.

State Administrators report a decline in number of proposals submitted This trend is attributed to the fact that the States have not had sufficient monies to fund more than one half of the qualified proposals in any year of its five-year history. Also contributing to the decline in proposal submissions is the fact that the institutions generally must provide the matching funds for the programs.

In over fifty nine percent of the projects completed in FY 1970 institutions of higher education provided the local dollars to match Federal grant funds. Participant fees were used for matching purposes in four percent of the programs. A combination of institutional monies and fees provided another fifteen percent. Thus almost eighty percent of the required matching funds were generated by the institutions. (See Table XIII). Private sources, such as foundations and business organizations contributed less than three percent. State and local government support was at about the same level. Although government funds have been used, in some measure, in almost twenty percent of the programs completed in FY 1970, most of these programs are concentrated in three states.

Organizations cooperating in programs have given much assistance to Title I projects. However, that assistance seldom takes the form of cash.

State Administrators estimate that twelve percent of these organizations gave dollar support to projects in which they were partners.

A few State Agencies do not match or undermatch Federal funds used for State administrative expenses. This was true of fourteen states in FY 1970, five of which relied solely on Federal funds to meet administrative expenditures. (See Table XIV) This increases the burden on the institutions which must make up the difference to enable the states to satisfy the statutory requirement that every two dollars of the total Federal allotment must be matched by one non-Federal dollar.

In projects that were continued after Title I funding had ceased, sources of support are more varied than were the sources of matching funds. Preliminary findings indicate that significantly more private support was found to continue projects than was available to match Federal funds when the project was initiated. (See Table XV)

Both State Agencies and institutions do a good job of managing what Federal money they do receive. The books were closed on five hundred and sixty projects in FY 1970. The original grant of Federal funds to these projects was $7 million. Only 4.4% or slightly more than $300,000 was not used. (See Table XVI)

Evaluation of the Program in a formal way, on a state-wide basis, has been accomplished in relatively few States. Most States, however, prepare annual reports that serve in some measure the function of evaluation and appear to be useful in the planning-evaluation cycle. The evaluative activities in the States have focused on institutional projects rather than on the overall State Program.

In the review of projects, State Administrators rely on a series of project reports and on a variety of project visitation - observation schemes. In Fiscal Year 1970, State Agency staff in 33 States visited 366 operating projects. Two States, California and Oklahoma, reported that all operating projects were visited during the year. Three States report that a single project was observed and one State indicated no site visits.

Reports required by the State Agencies vary greatly in format and in frequency. Thirty-one of 35 States require an "end-of-project" report that presumably includes an evaluation of the activity Ten States, although not the same States, require quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports. Three States require reports on a monthly basis. The requirement of monthly reporting on small-dollar projects seems excessive. On the other hand, the absence of a well-defined end-of-project report could be termed irresponsible. The Pennsylvania State Agency requires, in addition to an end-of-project report, a mid-point report when projects are funded for eight months or longer. Reports are useful to project directors, State Administrators and national staff. Such reporting schemes should contribute to well-defined planning and development goals at institutional, State and national levels.

The evaluation of a State Program involves more than evaluating a series of individual projects. It involves an assessment of how well the projects have been coordinated toward the priority problems set forth in State Plans, and many other factors which can not be derived from the evaluation of individual projects. Data useful to the States in evaluating their state-wide programs will also be useful to the Office of Education in evaluating the Community Service and Continuing Education Program nationally.

Conclusions

State administered programs of Community Service and Continuing Education have made commendable progress toward the reciprocal goals of assisting in the solution of community problems and strengthening the community service capability of colleges and universities. In 1965 continuing education activities were carried on almost exclusively by the land grant colleges, state universities, and a few large private institutions of higher education. By 1970, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 had encouraged more than 700 colleges and universities to become involved in the national program of community services. In the past year alone more than 600 institutions sought Federal support to continue community education activities and to develop new services.

Title I involvement has in some measure generated new money for institutional use. In a few cases the new money has been provided by state government directly or through increased appropriations to public universities. For a sizeable group of institutions, the link made with outside organizations and agencies has provided support for the continuation of specific community service projects.

New administrative structures for community services have been established. There are 33 off-campus centers currently operating in 23 states as a result of Federal support under Title I. In addition, colleges and universities have initiated on-campus community service centers to serve a variety of purposes and a wide range of community residents. Further investigation of these operations should provide alternative "models" which could be replicated in many other institutions of higher education. In addition to the establishment of new structures, a majority of participating institutions have appointed an individual or designated an office for Community Service and Continuing Education. These offices are making important contributions to the planning and coordinating functions within their institutions.

The development of new courses of study and new curricular arrangements provide further evidence of Program impact on institutions of higher education. New courses are frequently adaptations of a community service project while existing courses are radically altered in form or content as a result of faculty participation in adult-oriented continuing education activities.

An undetermined number of new faculty positions have been added. This result contrasts markedly with a tendency to hire staff members "for the life of a Federal grant" which has often characterized institutional administrative action under many other Federal programs.

There is a discernable shift in college-community relations attributable to Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The general pattern of relationships between institutions and community residents or agencies is that of "Educator-Client" but this relationship is changing to that of "Partners in Problem-Solving" as innovative programs of community education are planned and conducted.

While the number of schools participating has mushroomed private institutions remain a minority. Last year they accounted for thirty percent of all proposals. Reports from the states and the institutions reveal the basic cause. The "private institution " has greater difficulty providing funds to match Federal dollars than does the "public institution."

In summary, many colleges and universities are now better able to play a vital role in assisting volunteer and professional organizations, State and local governments, and groups of concerned citizens to apply new knowledge and to employ improved skills to the problems of their communities. In the words of one State Administrator, Title I has not yet produced a garden but it has provided a sack full of seeds.

Concurrent with institutional change are changes in community agencies and in the processes of their cooperation. In our complex urban-industrial society few, if any, pervasive community problems may be solved at a one-stop service station. Problem-solving is a process, a set of activities that must involve individuals, agencies and institutions in continuing assessment-action-reassessment-new action.

Data from the several sources employed in this review reveal that a substantial number of community agencies have been strengthened. Reports from the States list hundreds of organizations which increased their community service capability in a variety of ways.

Community agencies now have better trained staff members. The structures of some organizations have been re-defined as the range of agency activity was expanded or reduced. Personnel have been re-assigned or up-graded as new techniques were employed in the delivery of services to the community.

Title I activity has also been responsible for the establishment of new community organizations that seek to serve new areas of concern or

to coordinate existing activities. Two examples are the Greater Homewood Community Corporation in Baltimore and the State-wide Magistrates Association of Tennessee.

New relationships between "official" communities and citizen groups now exist and others are being developed. There is good evidence that communication gaps are being closed in a large number of communities. The processes of problem solving are not effective without discussion and dialogue, thus improved communication is both a tangible result and the basis for future problem-solving activity.

There have been many successes and few failures in each State's project activity. This review identifies certain factors--the presence or absence of which--exert a significant influence on project viability. There must be a real community need and it must be recognized as such by some organized group or at least by the group's leadership. The target group or its representatives must be involved in planning the community service or continuing education activity. Responsibility for unsuccessful programs was largely attributed to university faculty "who planned in a vacuum." Projects with weak or no support from community agencies appear to have little chance of success. A frequently cited cause of project failure may be phrased as "poor public relations" or "breakdown in communications." Conversely good communications and excellent rapport with local officials are positive virtues associated with success in attacking community problems.

In summary, community problem-solving processes function best when colleges and community agencies have shared goals, clear communications and take joint responsibility for identifying needs, assessing results and planning for further educational activity.

The theory of "the New Federalism" institutionalizes the concept of State determination and administration. The goal is to initiate a partnership between the various levels of government thus bringing decision points closer to the people. Within this framework, the strengths and weaknesses of State agencies may be viewed.

State Agencies for Community Service and Continuing Education have served well in a tactical operations role in the First Five years of the Program. Each State agency has greater knowledge about and understanding of community problems. These agencies have developed patterns of relationships with institutions of higher education that would be difficult to duplicate at any other political level. While there are some trouble spots, in most States a valuable partnership has emerged. Because of its proximity to colleges and universities, the State agency has the opportunity to closely monitor and evaluate institutional projects. It is unlikely that a comparable job could be accomplished on a national or even a regional basis.

The State Agencies, within the limits of available resources, have done well in monitoring and reporting their projects. However, to complete the task of program review and assessment larger resources are needed for state administration. Increased funding would enable the states to hire a full time

staff, or its equivalent, to administer Title I. The State Agencies would be able to improve the data bases which support the problem solving priorities in each state. They would also be able to improve the criteria for state-wide evaluation and revise the reporting procedures at institutional and state levels.

The ability to coordinate related Federal programs within a state resides in a state level agency and there is some evidence that such coordination is taking place. The development of a State Program of Community Service and Continuing Education should head the list of goals to be achieved. Toward this end, the states should be encouraged to develop administrative and coordinative mechanisms to insure more effective use of the existing and growing number of Federal programs that speak to the continuing education of adults. Present State Agencies for the administration of Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965, adequately funded and staffed, appear to be a sound base on which to build.

Federal support must be more than monetary if maximum program effectiveness is to be achieved. Present fragmentation of responsibility for Federal programs of continuing education for adults at the state level reflects a similar fragmentation at the Federal level. Improved Federal coordination is also a requirement if national needs and priorities are to be met.

The role of the Office of Education should be expanded to provide increased technical assistance in such areas as comprehensive planning and in-service training. In addition national guidelines should be refined and an operational model for state-wide evaluation should be developed.

In summary, the majority of currently operating state agencies are performing well and if provided with additional resources, including qualified personnel, could assume a strategic role of developing and coordinating state-wide Programs of University Community Service.

TABLE I

NUMBER AND TYPE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS BY FISCAL YEAR

Type of Institution	FY 1967*		FY 1968*		FY 1969*		FY 1970	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Land Grant and State Univs.	63	20	85	21	79	22	90	18
Four Year Public Insts.	122	39	138	34	108	31	134	27
Four Year Private Insts.	85	27	120	30	105	30	169	34
Two Year Public Insts.	38	12	53	13	46	14	96	19
Two Year Private Insts.	6	2	8	2	13	3	12	2
TOTALS	314	100	404	100	351	100	501	100

*The lists for FY 1967-1969 include only those institutions receiving Federal funds while the FY 1970 list includes all primary and cooperating institutions. Comparable figures for FY 1968 and FY 1969 were 447 and 454 institutions respectively.

50 414

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL PROGRAM FUNDS BY TYPE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTION BY FISCAL YEAR

Type of Institution	FY 1967 Federal* Funds	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Federal Funds	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Federal Funds	FY 1969 Percentage	FY 1970 Federal Funds	FY 1970 Percentage
Land Grant and State Univs.	$4,500.4	51.3	$4,526.6	51.7	$4,226.4	49.7	$4,047.2	47.7
Four Year Public Insts.	1,693.1	19.3	1,935.8	22.1	1,717.8	20.2	1,824.3	21.5
Four Year Private Insts.	1,965.1	22.4	1,711.1	19.5	1,777.3	20.9	1,824.5	21.5
Two Year Public Insts.	552.7	6.3	538.9	6.1	663.3	7.8	752.2	8.8
Two Year Private Insts.	61.4	.7	48.4	.6	119.1	1.4	39.3	.5
TOTALS	$8,772.7	100	$8,760.8	100	$8,503.9	100	$8,487.5	100

* In Thousands of dollars

TABLE III

NUMBER OF PROJECTS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED

Area Served	FY 1967 Number	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Number	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Number	FY 1969 Percentage	FY 1970 Number	FY 1970 Percentage
Urban	354	59	378	52	364	56	284	47
Urban/Suburban	88	15	95	14	50	7	61	10
Rural	50	8	59	8	58	9	66	11
Comprehensive	110	18	189	26	181	28	199	32
TOTALS	602	100	721	100	653	100	610	100

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED

Area Served	FY 1967 Federal* Funds	FY 1967 Percentage	FY 1968 Federal Funds	FY 1968 Percentage	FY 1969 Federal Funds	FY 1969 Percentage	FY 1970 Federal Funds	FY 1970 Percentage
Urban	$4.9	56	$4.8	54.5	$5.1	60	$4.27	51
Urban/Suburban	1.1	12	1.1	12.5	.1	6	.83	10
Rural	.7	8	.7	8.0	.6	7	.85	10
Comprehensive	2.1	24	2.2	25.0	2.3	27	2.53	29
TOTALS	8.8	100	8.8	100.0	8.5	100	8.48	100

* In Millions of dollars.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF PROJECTS BY PROBLEM AREA

Problem Area	FY 1967	FY 1968	FY 1969	FY 1970
Community Development	83	173	177	152
Education*	-	-	-	42
Employment	20	16	22	10
Economic Development	20	17	22	27
Government	159	173	152	90
Health	62	60	45	44
Housing	7	5	4	7
Human Relations	30	31	42	47
Land Use	57	43	23	35
Poverty	46	25	33	36
Personal Development	26	35	58	73
Recreation	36	37	33	17
Transportation	12	7	2	3
Youth Opportunities	44	43	40	27
TOTALS	602	721	653	610

* Separate category started in FY 1970 for projects related to the education system, most of which were previously included in the "Government" category.

54 CC

TABLE VI

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL AND LOCAL PROGRAM FUNDS BY PROBLEM AREA
(In thousands of dollars)

Problem Areas	FY 1967		FY 1968		FY 1969		FY 1970	
	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Federal Funds	Local Funds
Community Development	$1,335.7	$529.6	$2,763.1	$2,943.5	$3,063.1	$2,162.6	$2,741.3	$1,934.9
Education*							510.5	360.7
Employment	309.3	119.6	226.7	303.1	264.4	188.9	100.8	51.9
Economic Development	334.8	133.3	221.6	221.7	206.7	180.0	316.3	266.1
Government	2,146.8	784.9	2,462.4	2,505.5	1,698.7	1,356.8	1,397.1	864.8
Health	694.4	297.0	516.7	527.0	417.0	379.7	345.4	192.8
Housing	89.0	47.2	65.4	65.4	13.0	10.1	70.5	72.8
Human Relations	629.9	247.7	297.3	314.3	694.9	566.4	614.5	379.3
Land Use	849.0	391.2	417.8	523.3	203.3	122.5	397.2	266.7
Poverty	819.8	276.0	390.3	409.2	421.5	269.6	560.3	335.7
Personal Development	324.2	109.2	481.1	515.5	762.3	578.9	774.3	691.5
Recreation	420.9	149.0	329.3	353.7	326.0	229.3	191.9	136.9
Transportation	155.0	55.4	68.7	145.6	4.6	2.8	46.8	42.5
Youth Opportunities	663.9	281.9	483.7	515.9	428.5	383.9	420.7	307.0
TOTALS	$8,772.7	$342.0	$8,778.1	$9,343.7	$8,504.0	$6,431.5	$8,487.5	$5,903.6

* Separate category started in FY 1970 for programs related to the education system most of which were previously included in the "Government" category.

TABLE VII

April 1970

Distribution of funds under P.L. 89-329, Higher Education Act, as amended
Title I, Community Services and Continuing Education:
FY 1970

State Amount[1/]

U.S. and Outlying Areas			$ 9,500,000
50 States and D.C.			$ 9,338,999
Alabama	174,707	New Mexico	121,084
Alaska	105,854	New York	485,753
Arizona	135,360	North Carolina	208,836
Arkansas	142,062	North Dakota	113,236
California	506,816	Ohio	325,054
Colorado	143,844	Oklahoma	153,920
Connecticut	162,807	Oregon	142,508
Delaware	111,306	Pennsylvania	349,235
Florida	231,724	Rhode Island	119,260
Georgia	197,128	South Carolina	156,614
Hawaii	116,439	South Dakota	114,106
Idaho	115,039	Tennessee	183,828
Illinois	332,436	Texas	333,603
Indiana	207,436	Utah	121,869
Iowa	158,862	Vermont	109,100
Kansas	148,596	Virginia	197,658
Kentucky	168,386	Washington	169,913
Louisiana	178,695	West Virginia	138,584
Maine	120,745	Wisconsin	189,322
Maryland	178,822	Wyoming	106,830
Massachusetts	215,348	District of Columbia	117,012
Michigan	283,968		
Minnesota	177,698		
Mississippi	149,826		
Missouri	197,785	Outlying Areas:	
Montana	114,763	American Samoa	25,611
Nebraska	130,820	Canal Zone	00
Nevada	109,524	Guam	26,994
New Hampshire	114,912	Puerto Rico	82,208
New Jersey	249,966	Virgin Islands	26,188

1/ Distribution of $9,500,000 with a basic amount of $100,000 to the 50 States and D.C.; $25,000 to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the balance distributed on the basis of estimated total resident population, 7/1/68.

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED, IN PROGRESS, AND PLANNED IN FY 1970
(BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR OF FUNDING)

State	Completed (fiscal years)					Total	In Progress (fiscal years)					Total	Planned (fiscal years)					Total	Total Projects
	66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		
Alabama	1	5	4	1	2	13		1		3		4					11	11	28
Alaska																			
Arizona			9			9			1	8		9					6	6	24
Arkansas			3	2		5			7	9	17	33							38
California	1	1	10	3		15			3	7		10							25
Colorado		2	2			4			4	9	8	21					3	3	28
Connecticut			5	8		13			2	4	13	19							32
Delaware											10	10							10
District of Columbia		2	2	2		6		1	4	2	1	8					2	2	16
Florida			3	5		8	2	2	3	6	4	17					6	6	31
Georgia	4	2	9	10	2	27		4	17	19	15	55					3	11	14	96
Hawaii									2			2					9	9	11
Idaho				4	1	5		5	7	9	10	31							36
Illinois											11	11							11
Indiana											10	10					5	5	15
Iowa			3	10	6	19			1	4	9	14					1	1	34

57 [illegible]

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED, IN PROGRESS, AND PLANNED IN FY 1970
(BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR OF FUNDING)

State	Completed (fiscal years)					Total	In Progress (fiscal years)					Total	Planned (fiscal years)					Total	Total Projects
	66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		
Kansas		5	4			9		1	5			6					9	9	24
Kentucky	1	1	8	5		15				9	10	19							34
Louisiana				3		3				5		5				1	6	7	15
Maine			4	3		7					6	6				2		2	15
Maryland			1	3		4			4	11	10	25							29
Massachusetts		4	4	3		11			2	6	13	21							32
Michigan		1	10	1		12		1	1	10		12				9		9	33
Minnesota			2	2		4					7	7				4		4	15
Mississippi					2	2					2	2							4
Missouri			7	3	3	13			1	6	13	20							33
Montana		8	6	2		16													16
Nebraska			4	2		6					7	7							13
Nevada				3		3													3
New Hampshire		1			2	3					3	3				4		4	10
New Jersey																			
New Mexico		4	1			5	3		2	9		14				9		9	28

58

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED, IN PROGRESS, AND PLANNED IN FY 1970
(BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR OF FUNDING)

State	Completed (fiscal years)					Total	In Progress (fiscal years)					Total	Planned (fiscal years)					Total	Total Projects
	66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		
New York		14	8			22		1	10	13		24					15	15	61
North Carolina	1	4	7	8		20		1	4	8	7	20					8	8	48
North Dakota			6			6				7		7					8	8	21
Ohio			2	3		5					19	19					4	4	28
Oklahoma			1		1	2				1	8	9							11
Oregon		1	2	3		6		1	4	3	4	12							18
Pennsylvania	5	2	1	16		24	1		3	2	9	15					17	17	56
Rhode Island			4	4		8		2	7	6	3	18							26
South Carolina	2	1	3	2		8					11	11					4	4	23
South Dakota		3	2	4		9					7	7							16
Tennessee			4	11	5	20					10	10					2	2	32
Texas			4	10		14	3	12	8	16	6	45					9	9	68
Utah		2				2				6		6							8
Vermont				2	1	3													3
Virginia		1	13	9		23	1		6	15	24	46					13	13	82
Washington	1	4	6	4		15			4	6	11	21							36

TABLE VIII

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED, IN PROGRESS, AND PLANNED IN FY 1970
(BY STATE AND FISCAL YEAR OF FUNDING)

State	Completed (fiscal years)					Total	In Progress (fiscal years)					Total	Planned (fiscal years)					Total	Total Projects
	66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		66	67	68	69	70		
West Virginia		1	1	15	4	21			2	13		15					2	2	38
Wisconsin		1	5	3		9		3	1	9	12	25					1	1	35
Wyoming											4	4							4
Guam																			
Puerto Rico		1				1				4		4							5
Virgin Islands				1	1														1
Total (51 States)	16	66	175	170	29	456	10	33	108	238	330	719			4	180		184	1359

*Source: Annual Reports Submitted by the States for FY 1970

TABLE IX

LENGTH OF INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS
FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED IN FISCAL YEAR 1970*
(BY STATE)

State	No. of Projects Completed	Anticipated Length (in Months)	Actual Length (in Months)	No. of Projects Revised	No. of New Projects	No. of Continued Projects
Alabama	13	11.0	21.8	8	6	7
Arizona	9	12.6	22.6	4	7	2
Arkansas	5	12.0	28.0	3		5
California	14	11.9	19.3	12	10	4
Colorado	5	10.8	26.4		3	2
Connecticut	13	10.1	14.5	3	10	3
District of Columbia	6	10.1	20.0	3	1	5
Florida	8	10.2	17.8	8	3	5
Georgia	27	10.5	20.0	14	23	4
Idaho	5	10.0	17.6		5	
Iowa	18	8.7	15.8	10	11	7
Kansas	9	12.2	16.2	2	6	3
Kentucky	14	12.0	17.0	10	9	5
Louisiana	6	7.0	8.5		3	3
Maine	7	13.0	17.7		5	2
Maryland	4	8.5	13.0		3	1
Massachusetts	11	12.3	23.2	1	6	5
Michigan	12	12.0	16.7	1	4	8
Minnesota	4	12.0	16.0	1	2	2
Missouri	11	12.3	18.9		1	10
Montana	16	9.5	19.9		12	4
Nebraska	6	15.0	19.0		3	3
Nevada	3	14.0	14.0		2	1
New Hampshire	3	7.7	16.0	1	1	2
New Mexico	5	9.4	20.4	4	3	2
New York	22	11.4	23.5	3	12	10
North Carolina	17	12.5	17.8	3	12	5
North Dakota	6	11.5	11.5	6	1	5
Ohio	5	12.0	15.6		1	4
Oklahoma	2	10.5	12.5		1	1
Pennsylvania	19	9.2	30.1	1	6	13

TABLE IX

State	No. of Projects Completed	Anticipated Length (in Months)	Actual Length (in Months)	No. of Projects Revised	No. of New Projects	No. of Continued Projects
Rhode Island	8	5.3	16.2		7	1
South Carolina	8	15.8	30.0	5	6	2
South Dakota	9	9.9	22.5	4	4	5
Tennessee	20	7.2	12.4	3	15	5
Texas	14	10.2	10.4	2	7	7
Utah	2	24.0	30.0			2
Vermont	3	7.3	10.6		2	1
Virgin Islands	1	8.0	8.0		1	
Virginia	23	8.2	17.7	16	14	9
Washington	15	9.2	20.5	1	7	8
West Virginia	21	9.2	13.0	7	12	9
Wisconsin	9	11.9	19.5	5	4	5
Total 43 states	438	10.9 (avg.)	21.0 (avg.)	143	251	187

Note* 1. The following states were not included in this Analysis: Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oregon Wyoming, Guam and Puerto Rico.

2. Source of data: Notices of Activation submitted by the States and Annual Reports for Fiscal Year 1970.

62

TABLE X

PRIMARY EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY
OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROJECTS
COMPLETED IN FISCAL YEAR 1970
(BY STATE)

State	Course	One Day Meeting	Conference	Technical Assistance	Research	Information Dissemination	Concurrent Combination	Total Projects Reported
Alabama	3	2	3	1			4	13
Arizona	2	1	2	2	2			9
Arkansas	1	3					1	5
California	3	4	3	1	1	1	1	14
Colorado		2						2
Connecticut	4	4	3	2				13
D.C.	1		3	1			1	6
Florida	3		1			1		5
Georgia	12	3	9		1			25
Idaho	1	1	2			1		5
Iowa	4	3	6	1			2	16
Kansas	3	2		1		1	2	9

63

TABLE X

State	Course	One Day Meeting	Conference	Technical Assistance	Research	Information Dissemination	Concurrent Combination	Total Projects Reported
Kentucky	7	1	4				1	13
Louisiana	1	2	2					5
Maine	3		3	1				7
Maryland	1		3					4
Massachusetts	1	3		1	1	1	4	11
Michigan	2	3		1	1	1	4	12
Minnesota		2		1			1	4
Missouri	6	1	1	2	1			11
Montana	6	1	5	3			1	16
Nebraska		4	2					6
Nevada	1			1	1			3
New Hampshire					1			1
New Mexico		1	1	3				5
New York	8	3	2	2	2		5	22
North Carolina	7	2	3	2	1	1	1	17
North Dakota	5		1					6
Ohio	2		2	1				5
Oklahoma				2				2

69 83

TABLE X

State	Course	One Day Meeting	Conference	Technical Assistance	Research	Information Dissemination	Concurrent Combination	Total Projects Reported
Pennsylvania	13	1		1	2		2	19
Rhode Island	8							8
So. Carolina	2	4		1			1	8
So. Dakota	3	2			2		2	9
Tennessee	8	2	7	3				20
Texas	3	3	1	4	2	1		14
Utah		1		1				2
Vermont	2				1			3
Virgin Islands	1							1
Virginia	6	3	4	1	1			15
Washington	5	3	2	2		2	1	15
West Virginia	11	5	3				2	21
Wisconsin	4	1		2	1	1		9
Total 43 states *	153	73	78	44	21	14	33	416

*In addition to the three states that submitted no Annual Report for FY 1970, eight States sent in reports with inadequate information regarding primary educational activity of projects completed in FY 1970.

65

TABLE XIII

SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS
FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
PROJECTS COMPLETED IN FY 1970
(In numbers and percentages)

	TYPE OF INSTITUTION					
	PUBLIC			PRIVATE		
SOURCE OF MATCHING	State U./ Land Grant C.	4 Year	2 Year	4 Year	2 Year	TOTALS
Institutional Funds	72 (52%)	63 (66%)	17 (77.2%)	42 (58%)	3 (75%)	197 (59.2%)
Fees	5 (3.7)	2 (2)		7 (9.5)		14 (4.2)
State/Local Government	9 (6.5)	10 (10.5)	1 (4.6)	3 (4)		23 (7)
Private Sources	2 (1.4)		1 (4.6)			3 (1)
MULTIPLE						
Inst. Funds/Fees	25 (18)	11 (11.5)	1 (4.6)	14 (19)		51 (15.3)
Inst. Funds/Govt.	12 (9)	4 (4)	2 (9.0)	7 (9.5)	1 (25)	26 (7.5)
Inst. Funds/Private	2 (1.4)	2 (2)				4 (1.2)
Inst./Govt./Fees	6 (4.3)	1 (1)				7 (2.1)
Inst./Govt./Private	1 (.7)	1 (1)				2 (.6)
Govt./Fees	4 (3)	2 (2)				6 (1.9)
				TOTAL PROJECTS		333 (100)

TABLE XIV

Administrative Expenditures
For Community Service and Continuing Education Programs
during FY 1970
by State

State	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Total Funds	Percentage of Total in Matching Local Funds
Alabama	$ 16,834	$ 8,417	$ 25,251	.333
Alaska	403	0	403	0
Arizona	14,566	7,283	21,849	.333
Arkansas	19,439	12,500	31,939	.391
California	35,596	17,798	53,394	.333
Colorado	25,000	7,451	32,451	.229
Connecticut	24,428	18,860	43,288	.435
Delaware	5,206	2,603	7,809	.333
District of Columbia	10,075	5,092	15,167	.335
Florida	21,736	12,162	33,898	.358
Georgia	23,828	11,915	35,743	.333
Hawaii	12,163	0	12,163	0
Idaho	23,983	7,031	31,014	.226
Illinois	25,000	13,044	38,044	.342
Indiana	35	18	53	.333
Iowa	22,662	11,703	34,365	.340
Kansas	19,242	2,679	21,921	.122
Kentucky	17,543	8,772	26,315	.333
Louisiana	8,780	4,390	13,170	.333
Maine	17,578	8,232	25,810	.318
Maryland	20,443	7,247	27,690	.261
Massachusetts	18,978	13,207	32,185	.410
Michigan	25,000	13,733	38,733	.354
Minnesota	25,000	19,034	44,034	.432
Mississippi	25,000	0	25,000	0
Missouri	12,163	10,321	22,484	.459
Montana	21,320	16,079	37,399	.429
Nebraska	9,399	4,700	14,099	.333
Nevada	23,624	6,775	30,399	.222
New Hampshire	17,980	8,350	26,330	.317
New Jersey	25,000	25,000	50,000	.

67

TABLE XIV

State	Federal Funds	Local Funds	Total Funds	Percentage of Total in Matching Local Funds
New Mexico	$ 19,168	$ 9,740	$ 28,908	.336
New York	35,000	30,213	65,213	.463
North Carolina	18,243	9,122	27,365	.333
North Dakota	14,765	7,382	22,147	.333
Ohio	18,000	7,387	25,387	.290
Oklahoma	25,000	12,500	37,500	.333
Oregon	25,000	0	25,000	0
Pennsylvania	13,057	6,529	19,586	.333
Rhode Island	21,386	11,581	32,967	.351
South Carolina	17,253	2,700	19,953	.135
South Dakota	9,154	5,832	14,986	.389
Tennessee	25,000	21,264	46,264	.459
Texas	18,600	0	18,600	0
Utah	25,000	13,358	38,358	.348
Vermont	12,579	6,328	18,907	.333
Virginia	16,802	8,402	25,204	.333
Washington	20,811	10,406	31,217	.333
West Virginia	22,218	9,866	32,084	.307
Wisconsin	13,000	7,001	20,001	.350
Wyoming	15,600	313	15,913	.196
Guam	200	1,110	1,310	.847
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	9,083	9,083	18,166	.500
TOTALS	$962,923	$474,513	$1,437,436	.330 (Average)

Smallest amount of Federal funds: $ 35 (Indiana)
Largest amount of Federal funds : 35,596 (California)
Average amount of Federal funds : 18,168 (Does not include Puerto Rico which reports no funds expended for administration.)

Source: FY 1970 Fiscal Reports from the States.

89

TABLE XV

Continuing Financial Support
for Community Service and Continuing Education Projects
Initiated Under Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965
by Source of Funds and By State

1966 - 1970

State	No. of Cont'd Projects	SOURCE OF FUNDS							
		Inst.	Foundation	Government State	Government Local	Government Federal	Community Organization	Combined	Fees
Alabama	None (1)								
Arkansas	2					1		1	
California	(2)								
Connecticut	11	6	3	1		1			
District of Columbia	2				1	1			
Florida	3	2						1	
Georgia	4			2		2			
Idaho	8	4	2				2		
Illinois	2	1						1	
Indiana									
Iowa	18	5			1		1	7	4
Kansas	19	3		3				13	
Kentucky	15	13				1	1		
Louisiana	3	2		1					
Maine	6	1				1		3	1
Maryland	5						1	4	
Michigan	7	2	1		2			2	
Mississippi	None								
Montana	13	1		2	2	2			6
North Carolina	1	1							
Oklahoma	4	4							
Oregon	No Response								
Pennsylvania	8	5						3	
Rhode Island	4	1						3	
South Carolina	11			4	1	2	2	2	
South Dakota	1								
Tennessee	6	3	1	1				1	
Texas	None								

TABLE XV

Continuing Financial Support
for Community Service and Continuing Education Programs
Initiated Under Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965
By Source of Funds and By State

1966 - 1970

State	No. of Cont'd Projects	SOURCE OF FUNDS							
		Inst.	Foundation	Government State	Government Local	Government Federal	Community Organization	Combined	Fees
Virginia	7	5			1			1	
West Virginia	6	2				1	2	1	
Wisconsin	17	6			2	2	7		
Wyoming	None (3)								
Puerto Rico	None								
Virgin Islands	1						1		
Totals 34 States	184	67	6	16	10	14	17	43	11

Notes:
(1) "Still Supporting all Under Title I"
(2) "Data not readily available"
(3) "All original Projects Continuing"

Source: Supplemental questionnaire completed by State agencies

TABLE XVI
Unexpended Project Funds, FY 1970
Community Service and Continuing Education Projects
By State and By Year of Project Grant

State	Year of Project Grant FY 1970	FY 1969	FY 1968	FY 1967	FY 1966
Alabama					
Alaska			6,038		
Arizona			3,513		
Arkansas					
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut		17,156	12,569		
Delaware					
District of Columbia					
Florida		691	11,481	186	
Georgia					
Hawaii					
Idaho			2,195		
Illinois			3,431		
Indiana					
Iowa		1,372	7,889	7,788	
Kansas					
Kentucky		764	4,902	2,321	
Louisiana		2	4,986		
Maine					
Maryland		1,300	8,175	2,675	2,880
Massachusetts				3,838	
Michigan			18,355	399	
Minnesota					
Mississippi					
Missouri		1,077			3,053
Montana					
Nebraska		684	2,899		

TABLE XVI
Unexpended Project Funds, FY 1970
Community Service and Continuing Education Projects
By State and By Year of Project Grant

State	Year of Project Grant				
	FY 1970	FY 1969	FY 1968	FY 1967	FY 1966
Nevada					
New Hampshire		33	679		7,932
New Jersey					
New Mexico			2,690		
New York			8,060	35,371	
North Carolina		3,240	19,822	8,252	14
North Dakota			144		
Ohio			10,378	119	
Oklahoma					
Oregon					
Pennsylvania		2,236	14,895	889	
Rhode Island		7,132	1,053		
South Carolina					20
South Dakota					
Tennessee		1,973	2,057		
Texas			1		
Utah					
Vermont		6,307	12,025		438
Virginia					
Washington				9,961	4,735
West Virginia			1,574	20,026	823
Wisconsin					
Wyoming					
Guam					
Puerto Rico		479			
Virgin Islands					
Totals		44,447	157,423	94,458	20,695

Source: FY 1970 Fiscal reports submitted by the States

72

ERIC Clearinghouse
JAN 18 1972
on Adult Education